

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2345/P	Paul seviour	12/07/2018 13:26:29	SUPC	<p>This application is a great improvement on the previous scheme which was withdrawn.</p> <p>The current application in terms of the architecture (its scale, the size and design of the windows, etc) much more fits in with the host building (the old false tooth factory).</p> <p>However, I have one objection and that relates to the colour scheme of the brickwork that has been proposed.</p> <p>It is important to note that the site is in the Inkerman Conservation Area. And it adjoins a significant heritage building (the factory), again in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>When residents in the Conservation Area submit applications for extensions to the rear of their houses, without exception they are required to use London Brick in order to match the host building. This is the case even though the rear extensions can't be viewed from the street. In one case, the private owner even used a liquid application to the London Brick which had the effect of aging the brick to the rear extension so that it matched the host building.</p> <p>This application is on the street and in a prominent position. It is located between two buildings of London Brick. It will be incongruous if the front façade of the proposed building is allowed to be built using a brick that does not match the adjoining buildings. And it goes against LB Camden planning policy that buildings or extensions in the Conservation Area use a colour of brick that is only London Brick.</p> <p>I support the application but only on condition that the brick work to the front façade is changed to that of London Brick. And it would be preferable if an application is used so that the bricks match the host building of the old factory.</p>
